

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,501	07/07/2005	Phaedria Marie St. Hilaire	ST.HILAIRE1A	4075
1444 BROWDY AN	7590 06/01/2007 JD NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.		EXAM	IINER
624 NINTH STREET, NW			WESSENDORF, TERESA D	
SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1639	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(a)			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	10/541,501	ST. HILAIRE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	T. D. Wessendorf	1639			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This action is non-final for treating to the subjection of the subjection of the subjection is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 3, 4, 6-7, 16, 29 and 31, drawn to a process for identifying specific members of a binding a pair.

Group II, claim(s) 3 and 22, drawn to a process for identifying specific members of a binding a pair wherein the ligand is a peptide library.

Group III, claim(s) 3, 26, drawn to a process for identifying specific members of a binding pair wherein the ligand library comprises peptidomimetics.

Group IV, claim(s) 3 and 30, drawn to a process for identifying specific members of a binding a pair wherein the ligand is identified using NMR spectroscopy.

Group V, claim(s) 88, drawn to a ligand or an isolated ligand-protein binding pair.

Group VI, claim(s) 88 and 89, drawn to a ligand with R1 and R2 having the different compounds as recited therein.

Group VII, claim(s) 43, 88 and 90, drawn to a ligand with the different definitions recited for R1-R3 compounds.

Group VIII, claim(s) 43 and 88, drawn to a ligand with the recited formula IV.

Group IX, claim(s) 43-44 and 88, drawn to a ligand selected from the compounds recited in claim 44.

Group X, claim(s) 46 and 88, drawn to the isolated ligand-protein binding pair.

Group XI, claim(s) 49 and 88, drawn to a ligand having Seq. ID. 14.

Group XII, claim(s) 50 and 88, drawn to an isolated ligandprotein binding pair comprising the compounds recite in claim 50.

Group XIII, claim(s) 77 and 88, drawn to a ligand with Seq. ID. 63.

Group XIV, claim(s) 78 and 88, drawn to an isolated ligandprotein binding pair comprising the sequences and compounds as recited in claim 78.

Group XV, claim(s) 35 and 88, drawn to a ligand comprising the compounds as recited therein.

Group XVI, claim(s) 36 and 88, drawn to an isolated ligand-binding pair comprising the compounds as recited therein.

The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: each groups do not have the same technical features due to the structural differences of the compounds in each groups.

The inventions listed as Groups V-XVI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: each groups do not have the same technical features due to the differences in the components and /or steps used in the process in order to perform each methods.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,501

Art Unit: 1639

The inventions listed as Groups (I-IV) and (V-XVI) do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: each of groups I-IV do not have the same technical features with each of groups V-XIV since the process is capable of identifying/producing structurally different compounds.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

If Group I or IV is elected; applicants are required to elect a single species of small organic molecule for the election to be proper. Small organic molecules are a genus).

- 1. Small organic molecules for a library as recited in claim 7.
 - 2. Type of living cells as recited in claim 16.

If **Group II or III** is elected, applicants are required to elect a single species of:

Peptide library (specify the kind of peptide e.g., if a named peptide or the length of the peptide comprised in a library).

If any one of **Group V -XVI** is elected, applicants are required to elect a single species from each of the recited compounds or sequences. For example, for Group VI, a single

species of R1 e.g., compound 3. This election has similar import to all the compounds comprised in a single claim as recited in groups VII-XVI.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP \$ 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

3, 7,16, 22, 26, 30, 36, 43, 44, 46, 49, 50, 77, 78 and 88-90. The following claim(s) are generic: 3, 7, 16, 22, 26, 30, 36, 43, 44, 46, 50, 78 and 88-90.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,501

Art Unit: 1639

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: each of the species e.g., in claim contain structurally different compounds/sequences. A prior art reference anticipating one species would not render obvious the other species.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,501 Page 8

Art Unit: 1639

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to T. D. Wessendorf whose telephone number is (571) 272-0812. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexitime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Schultz can be reached on (571) 272-0763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T. D. Wessendorf Primary Examiner Art Unit 1639

Tdw May 21, 2007